This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Educ 4300.12.25

HARVARD
COLLEGE
LIBRARY

FROM THE
Subscription Fund
BEGUN IN 1858

METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY.

REMARKS

ON

THE MINISTERIAL PLAN

OF A

CENTRAL

UNIVERSITY EXAMINING BOARD.

LONDON:

EFFINGHAM WILSON, ROYAL EXCHANGE.

COMPTON AND RITCHIE, PRINTERS, MIDDLE STREET, CLOTH FAIR.

1836.

Educ 4300.12.25
Jan 1895

HARVARD COLLEGE
July 26. 1875
LIBRARY

Subscription fund

"By the PRINCIPLE OF UTILITY is meant that principle which approves or disapproves of every action whatsoever, according to the tendency which it appears to have to augment or diminish the happiness of the party whose interest is in question; or, what is the same thing in other words, to promote or to oppose that happiness. I say of every action whatsoever; and, therefore, not only of every action of a private individual, but of every measure of government."—*Bentham.*

REMARKS, &c.

It will be remembered, that during the administration of Sir Robert Peel, a resolution was carried in the House of Commons requesting the Crown to grant a charter to the London University, "as approved by the law officers in 1831, and containing no other restriction than against granting degrees in divinity and medicine." The answer returned to this Address stated, that a report of the proceedings of the Privy Council (to whom the matter had been referred in the preceding year), had been called for, "in order that His Majesty may be enabled to judge what may be the best mode of carrying into effect the wishes of his faithful Commons in respect of the grant of a charter to the University of London, and what may be the conditions with which such a grant ought to be accompanied." But before any thing definitive had been done on this Address, the change of administration occurred, and the important discussions which immediately afterwards occupied Parliament and the nation, for a while diverted attention from the subject.

Towards the end of July, the new Government announced its intention of creating a central University, "comprising a board of examiners, number indefinite, to be appointed by the Crown, with power to confer degrees *on candidates from all parts of the United Kingdom, and* FROM EVERY SEMINARY OF EDUCATION, WHETHER CHARTERED OR UNINCORPORATED*," instead of merely granting the prayer of the London University for a degree-conferring charter particular to itself. The latter, however, was to have had a *collegiate* charter, similar (except, of course, as to reduction of style) to the charter prepared in 1831.

By many of the friends of universal education—by many, too, not among the least sincere well-wishers to the London University in particular—this announcement was hailed with great satisfaction; not only because it was deemed that the new University would be in

* This is given on the authority of Mr. Tooke, as founded on *information communicated by Government to the Council.*—"*University of London: Statement of Facts as to Charter*," page 4.

itself a very important benefit, but also because it appeared to mark a new æra in the connexions of the governing body of this country with its science and literature. It seemed to constitute the first act by which the Government distinctly assumed *the initiative* in any measure intended, directly or indirectly, for the advancement of general education.

The Government for the time being had, indeed, occasionally rendered a reluctant assistance when it had been, as it were, *compelled* to do so; but the question with it was never "how may the interests of science be most promoted," but "with how small a concession to public opinion can we escape for the present:" never, "in what way can we best advance the education of the people," but "with how little can we satisfy this or the other body of men."

It seemed well, then, to find the present Government, instead of granting reluctantly, after nearly five years of petitioning and struggling, a degree-conferring charter to the London University, coming forward with a large and well-considered measure, at once fully comprehending the object immediately sought by the petitioners, and extending its operation and its benefits to the community at large; it seemed to augur well for the full and fair discussion of the coming question, of a comprehensive and centralized system of National Education.

But in the midst of all these pleasant anticipations appeared a "*Statement of Facts*"—certainly not remarkable either for candour, consistency, or good temper—issued by Mr. Tooke, on the part of the London University, in which the Government was accused of tergiversation and direct breach of engagement, in substituting the general charter for the particular one; and the new plan was denounced as likely to lead to various ill results, such as an "indiscriminate and unlimited issue of degrees," &c. This "statement" even went so far as to threaten stout *resistance* on the part of the London University, as the best "antidote to this strange device" (page 4).

Mr. Tooke grounded his charge of breach of faith upon the following statements: first, that "so long ago as the year 1831, the Council were encouraged by the then government of Lord Grey to apply for a charter of incorporation as an University, with all the privileges incident to that title: and a charter to that effect having been carefully prepared, was approved by the law officers of the crown; and, after receiving the sanction of the sign-manual twice,

and the usual official verifications, was stayed just previously to its last stage of passing the great seal, by the interposition of memorials to the crown from the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge;" secondly, that "Ministers, before resigning in November last, had resolved to grant the charter, with only the restrictions mentioned in the House of Commons' address since voted;" thirdly, that "the new arrangement is altogether at variance with His Majesty's gracious answer; and, fourthly, also at variance "with the votes and professions of his present ministers" in supporting Mr. Tooke's motion on the 26th of March.

The first count, as to the proceedings under Lord Grey's government in 1831, was obviously irrelevant, since it in nowise constituted a proof of the *present* government having been pledged to any particular measure; and as to the third,—His Majesty's answer,—given under a government avowedly hostile to the measure—it must be considered a promise for just so much as it expressed, and no more; and there is in it nothing which can, with any fairness, be construed into a promise of the specific and *exclusive* charter contended for; both these objections, then, resolved themselves into the simple question, whether the legitimate object of the London University would or would not be *in substance* accomplished;—a question which will be discussed presently. The gravamen of the charge of breach of faith lay, therefore, in the alleged determination of Ministers before November, and in their conduct on the 26th of March. Now the mere narrative of what occurred during the debate on the last mentioned day will clear up both of these points, and shew the utter fallacy of the charge. In the course of his speech in support of the motion, Lord John Russell stated, that "the late Government, and Lord Brougham more especially, were earnestly occupied in considering—first, whether it was possible to obtain the consent of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge that protestant dissenters might study and take their degrees in them; secondly, whether a charter given to the University of London should enable protestant dissenters to take their degrees there; and, thirdly, *whether any other and larger plan might be devised to meet the difficulties which presented themselves on this question, and to facilitate the entrance of dissenters* (of course, in order to the obtaining degrees) either into the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, *or into other places.*

In the same debate (and *before* Lord John Russell rose), Mr.

Warburton, member for Bridport, and one of the earliest friends of the London University, thus expressed himself:—"If the right hon. gentlemen opposite think that the Professors of the London University would have too great an interest in multiplying degrees, let them come forward with a proposal to establish one general University for London, comprehending the King's College, as well as the London University; and let them appoint *a set of examiners of their own, to determine upon the granting of degrees wholly independent of the professors of the two colleges.* * * * * * * *If they will come forward with such a proposition as this, I pledge myself that I, and I believe all the other members of the council, will withdraw our opposition at once.*"

Here, in the very discussion on which the address to the Crown was voted, we find a member of the council of the London University, *suggesting* the substitution of a general charter, and confidently promising the concurrence of the council in such a measure;—we find Lord John Russell following that suggestion, by stating that the late government had some such plan, with others, under its consideration, and had *not* resolved what course to adopt up to the time of its dissolution in November; that, in fact, with the members of that government, the question was still an open one; member after member rising from all parts of the house to approve the—to them—new plan as worthy of consideration, and at last Mr. Tooke himself bringing up the rear,—With a declaration of his entire dissent from the new proposition? No. With an exposure of the misrepresentation by the hon. member for Bridport, of the sentiments of the London University Council? No. With a hearty burst of indignation against the Whig government for allowing it to be "understood" that they had resolved to grant a charter "which they had not resolved to grant?" Oh, no! nothing of all this; but with a remark or two about Oxford and Cambridge, in reply to Sir Robert Inglis; and as to the rest, utter silence. Yet, after a lapse of six months came forward the same Mr. Tooke, to express his *extreme astonishment*, that ministers should have adopted a course so "extraordinary and unaccountable," and to stigmatize their conduct as treacherous!

But what was there in the proposed plan which, *had* the Government been pledged, as is represented by Mr. Tooke, would have constituted a breach of such pledge? The avowed object of the London University in seeking the power to confer degrees was,

that parents and guardians might be the more induced to send students, the latter being certain to obtain such distinctions as their exertions might merit. The Council had declared repeatedly (and Mr. Tooke renewed the assertion in his "Statement"), that "they desired no exclusive privileges." Well, that object was attained; the students of the London University, *in common with those of* ALL *other institutions*, were to have had the certainty of obtaining from the central examining board the degrees and marks of distinction they might merit.

But, said Mr. Tooke, "there is obvious risk of sacrifice of principle and independence in placing them [London University, King's College, &c,] *pari passu*, in subordination to a supreme board, *in which ultimate partiality cannot by any possibility be guarded against*, and whose influence in determining or virtually recommending the course of education, or in prescribing some middle line, will have a tendency to introduce a compromise among the methods of instruction in the several subordinate colleges, and involve a necessity for mutual concession, highly prejudicial to the vigorous progress of unfettered originality of design."

In every case in which powers, of what kind soever, are granted to any body of men, there will be a tendency more or less rapid to their abuse: this tendency is only to be checked by removing, first, as much as possible the ordinary *motives* and opportunities of abuse; and, secondly, and chiefly, by providing for effectual *responsibility*. It is probable, then, that the force of this objection will be most correctly estimated, by comparing the first ministerial plan of a general university with that of a special charter to the London University in these respects.

The examiners under the new plan must have been men of extensive acquirement and high public reputation, including, of course, men of different political opinions: to these would probably have been confided, in the first place, the preparation of certain statutes and rules for the government of the university, which statutes must have received the sanction, and, if need were, the amendment of the legislature, thereby passing through the ordeal of public opinion; thus settled, they would have constituted the rule of the examiners until altered in the same way and by the same authority. The examiners, therefore, however ready to exercise such an injurious interference as that which Mr. Tooke deprecated by anticipation, would have been without the power. In a Board so constituted it is not easy to

conceive what motives there could have been to the "ultimate partiality" which Mr. Tooke declared to be inevitable; for let the partialities of individual members have been ever so strong, since they were not and could not have been connected by any common interest in any one place or any one plan of education, these partialities would have neutralized one another. To talk of an unfair or "indiscriminate and unlimited issue of degrees," *because* the Examining Board would have had to receive candidates from all parts of the kingdom without limitation, was an absurdity. What, on the other hand, was to have been expected, if the London University had had a charter to itself? According to Mr. Tooke's own statement, the Examining Board must consist, at least at first, *of the Professors*. The examinations, then, would have become necessarily—be the professors who and what they might—much rather tests of the retentiveness and mental submissiveness of the student, than of his ability and general knowledge. Were a professor careless and indolent, he would be sure to find ability enough in his pupils to save him, at least for awhile, from disgrace. His class would, perhaps, become renowned for the number of degrees obtained in it. Did an ineffective system of instruction prevail in any branch, these professorial examinations would have had a direct tendency to uphold and perpetuate, instead of detecting and reforming it. Students being attracted to the University by the facility of obtaining degrees, every Professor would have had a direct pecuniary interest in conferring as many as possible. Is this a position in which any reflecting man would desire to be placed? What more likely—nay, judging by experience, what more certain—to have led to an "indiscriminate and unlimited issue of degrees" than this?

Then compare the two plans as to that effectual responsibility without which the wisest precautions against abuse avail nothing. In the one case the Examining Board would have been, from its constitution, directly responsible to public opinion for every act; and exposed to that influence from a thousand quarters, an abuse of its powers being recognized as an injury, not by the students of a single institution but by those of all parts of the kingdom, as well as by the isolated student in his remote chamber.

What, contrasted with this, is the responsibility which a council has to a proprietary body, or a proprietary body to the public?

May we not conclude, then, that the evils of "partiality," "want

of discrimination," and injurious "prescriptions as to course of education," were far less likely to flow from a board of examiners entirely independent of the professors of the subordinate colleges, having no pecuniary interest in the number of degrees conferred, *bound to no especial plans or places of education—whether one or several*—than from a board or multiplicity of boards, composed of such professors, or their graduates, having such a pecuniary interest, and naturally engrossed and bound up, in a greater or less degree, in their own plans and modes and systems; and that, therefore, as far as the London University in particular was concerned, it would have been advantaged and not injured by the substitution of a board of examiners of the former constitution in the place of one of the latter?

In the first place, then, the Government was *not* pledged to grant a *specific* charter to the London University, giving *to it* the power to confer degrees; although, *had there been* such a pledge, it would have been redeemed by the creation of a general university, conferring degrees on the students of the London University, *and upon all others*, without restriction to locality.

In the second place, the London University would have fully attained the object which motived it—according to its own avowal—to seek a charter, although in a modified *form*.

But if both these conclusions had been wrong—if both were utterly untenable, the chief question at issue—the only *vital* one—still remained; that question was—whether the proposed central university board, *open to all*, would or would not have been a greater public benefit than the grant of a degree-conferring charter to the London University or College in particular, or to that and a certain number of other colleges in particular, and to them only.

Whatever may be the "great and paramount advantages*" of the London University, it is beyond controversy, that there are in the United Kingdom many other educational institutions possessing equal claims to the power of granting degrees: this being the case, if the former (which, be it remembered, desired "no exclusive privilege") had had a particular charter, these, too, must have had particular charters. But how frame a rule at once to have included all that deserved (because combining the necessary means of education), and to have given reasonable security to the public against the abuse of the power? If the deductions as to the probability of such abuses in the London University, so circumstanced, be at all reason-

* *Statement of Facts*, page 3.

able, how must such abuses have been multiplied by the creation of a number of similarly isolated bodies scattered throughout the kingdom, alike devoid of broad and efficient responsibility.

Then, indeed, there might have been some reason to have expected that "indiscriminate and unlimited issue of degrees," the mere apprehension of which so frightened Mr. Tooke "from his propriety" as to have made him say, that "such institutions as attach importance to their own scale of attainments *must devise some peculiar designations and initials* to relieve themselves from any supposed identity with the *abortive creations* of this royal board of salaried commissioners*." But if even these objections could have been removed, why have fought a series of battles—and judging from the example just quoted, new opponents would quickly have joined the ranks of the old ones—when the contest might have been closed by one decisive action?

But, again; *had all the institutions in the country which could possibly advance pretensions to the power in question have obtained it, the object of the friends of really universal education would have been by no means achieved,* that object being twofold;—first, that degrees should truly represent what they profess to represent, viz. certain positive acquirements or general ability; and 2dly, that such degrees should be attainable by all, *without exception,* possessed of those acquirements or that ability, *in what way soever obtained.* To require more than this is quite as absurd as it is tyrannical. It is as injurious to the persons or places favoured as to those excluded. For so long as a factitious advantage—a pure accident—is allowed to form *part* of a qualification for a degree, that factitious advantage is, *pro-tanto,* a deduction from the real knowledge represented or intended to be represented by that degree†. What more likely than this to deaden exertion, to encourage indolence? If, too, it be determined that an exclusive prescription of this kind ought no longer to be possessed by our ancient universities of Oxford and Cambridge, hallowed as they are with the recollections of eight centuries, adorned as they are with so much that is great and wise and good—should new prescriptions be created in favour of institutions possessing no such claims to reverence?

May it not, then, be asserted, without fear of contradiction, that a general examining board, having power to confer degrees *on all*

* "Statement of Facts," page 4.

† "Whatever forces a certain number of students to any College or University, independent of the merit or reputation of the teachers, tends, more or less, to diminish the necessity of that merit or reputation."—*Wealth of Nations,* Book 5, chap. 1, vol. iii, p. 155, 8th edit. 8vo, Lond. 1796.

persons who come to it possessed of the required qualifications, would have been of greater PUBLIC UTILITY than an examining board having power to confer degrees *on the students of a certain number of colleges and schools*—no matter how large the number—*and on them alone?* May not this, too, be asserted solely on the ground, that every man *ought* to have within his reach the means of obtaining a degree, if he have acquired the knowledge a degree professes to represent, whether the place *wherein* he acquired that knowledge shall have been a cloistered college, a populous city, or a secluded village?—and therefore, leaving altogether apart and beside other and most important reasons—e. g. the effect of the more extensive plan in raising and maintaining the character of the examinations themselves; the advantage of affording *an universally applicable test of the ability,* at least to a certain degree, *of schoolmasters**; and many others,—each of which might singly be sufficient to the argument.

This, then, being the position of the question between the London University and the Government—the latter having apparently disobliged the former in order to confer an increased benefit on the public at large—what has the Government *done* to carry its good intentions *into effect?*

As yet, nothing of which the public have any *direct* information; what, however, *it now intends to do,* is, it appears, to be learnt *indirectly.*

In November the Senate of the University of London published "An Address to the Council on the proposed establishment of a Metropolitan University;" in which the plan of the Government is announced as having been "made known by the Attorney General, in reply to a question by Mr. Tooke† *and since more fully explained by a written communication to the Council of the University from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and by conversation in two inter-*

* The want of which is certainly not among the least of the causes of there being so many incompetent schoolmasters; and although it may be granted, that nothing short of the general establishment of *Normal Schools* throughout the country will *radically* cure this great evil, the new University Examining Board, *if it be open to all,* must indisputably prove a valuable *subsidiary* means.

† In the House of Commons on the 17th July, according to the "*Statement*" (*p. 2*). *It is remarkable, that no notice whatever of the conversation is taken, either in "The Mirror of Parliament," in Hansard, or in Northcroft's "Chronicle," so that there is no public account of what the Attorney General really did say.*

views, in which a deputation from the Council and Senate was received by that right hon. gentleman and the Secretary of State for the Home Department."

Before extracting the exposition, thus prefaced, of the Government plan by the Senate of the London University, it will be well to recall the exact words used by Mr. Tooke in *his* exposition of the same plan *founded on information communicated to the Council*, and contained in the P.S. to the "*Statement of Facts*" already so often alluded to. The words are these: "instead, however, of such board extending, *as was* AT FIRST *intimated*, only to incorporated colleges within the metropolis and its vicinity, it now appears that candidates for degrees will be admitted *from all parts of the United Kingdom*, AND FROM EVERY SEMINARY OF EDUCATION, WHETHER CHARTERED OR UNINCORPORATED."

We now come to the exposition contained in the address of the Senate, founded, as we have seen, on the additional information obtained at *two interviews*.

"The Government proposes to establish, and incorporate by charter as a university, a new body, composed of gentlemen of the highest eminence in learning and science; and this university will be empowered to examine and confer degrees in arts, medicine, and law; that is, in all the customary faculties *except theology**. These degrees will be conferred *upon the students of certain colleges and* [of certain] *other schools of professional education, placed in connexion with the University, either by being named in the original charter, or by a subsequent act of the Crown*; AND UPON NONE OTHER. The colleges for general education, which are to be named in the original charter, are the existing LONDON UNIVERSITY AND KING'S COLLEGE; *upon the students of these alone will degrees in arts be conferred in the first instance*: but a power will be reserved to the Crown of admitting *any similar institution* to the same privileges. Medical degrees will be conferred upon students not only from these

* Why "except theology?" The question cannot be answered without exposing the utter absurdity, as well as mischievousness, of the mutilated plan. If it be said, "because *in the University of London* there is no instruction in theology," it is but another proof of the folly of an *exclusive* charter. In truth, as the term "university" has been, up to the present time, understood, the College in Gower Street, *cannot*, from its very constitution, become a "university" unless that term receive a new definition in its ordinary as well as legal sense. See the arguments in the case of *Bentley* against the *University of Cambridge*, in 2,—Lord Raymond's Reports, p. 1345. It cannot be too often repeated, that, to be consistent, to be reasonable, the new Board should have to do *not with means, but with results.*

two institutions, but from other medical schools*. The members of the new University will be nominated by the Crown", &c.

After this, the resolutions proposed and passed at a meeting of the proprietors of the London University, on the first of December—whatever may be thought of the part taken by certain *individuals*—could not excite much surprise.

Mr. Tooke proposed the first resolution, in these words:—"That although the tenor of His Majesty's gracious answer to the address of the House of Commons for a charter to enable the London University to grant degrees in all the faculties except theology and medicine, was not fully realized, yet, as the Government had prepared *a comprehensive and efficient plan*, this meeting agrees to the same, *resting with confidence on the board of examiners to be appointed by Government.*" But after much discussion on this resolution, the following was substituted for it, and carried:—"That His Majesty's Ministers having, *in consequence of* the gracious answer returned from the Throne to the address of the House of Commons, devised *a* MORE *efficient and comprehensive plan* than was contemplated for giving academical honours in all the faculties except divinity,—this Meeting is satisfied that this institution has nothing to fear from competition, and cordially and gratefully accepts the new plan, and recommends it for the adoption of the Council."

That the Council of the London University should willingly accept *such a plan as this* at the hands of the Government, after its contemptuous rejection of *the former plan*—it is assumed, for the moment, that the opinions expressed in Mr. Tooke's "Statement," were those of *the Council*—need surprise nobody: the rejection of the one and acceptance of the other are, under the circumstances, perfectly consistent; both arising out of what seems to be a settled determination to prefer the prospect of an immediate advantage—however petty, however unsubstantial an advantage—to their own institution, rather than the interest of the public at large. And let it be observed, there is here no gratuitous *assumption* that their conduct involves a preferring, *knowingly*, this particular interest to the public interest, since the question has been industriously paraded as one *lying altogether between the Government and the London*

* Without limitation?—If this be the best plan for conferring degrees *in Medicine*—and Mr. Tooke admitted that, "Statement," p. 3—why in Medicine alone?

University; and hitherto there has not been the shadow of an attempt to assert or insinuate that the interest *of the public* is promoted by making degrees accessible to the students of certain *chartered* colleges only, as *now* proposed; instead of making them accessible to all students, *without limitation,* as was proposed in September.

In effect, this mutilated plan gives to the London University *an exclusive charter, for the present, as far as general Education is concerned.* King's College, which is to be placed conjointly with it under the Examining Board,—having always avowed itself the mere off-shoot of Oxford and Cambridge,—has never sought the power of granting degrees, but has always said that those who wanted them should go to the ancient universities. Has it given any indication of change in this respect? If not, how will this new charter differ from the one first contended for by Mr. Tooke? And further, if King's College remain under its present religious discipline, *can* it accept degrees at the hands of the new Board, from which divinity is to be rigorously excluded; divinity having always formed a part of the examinations for degrees in arts at Oxford and at Cambridge? That King's College should refuse to accept degrees in arts from the qualifications for which divinity is altogether excluded, will be only consistent with its professions and past conduct.

Behold, then, a key to the mysterious change from such language as - - - "abortive creations of this royal board of salaried commissioners" - - - "a vehicle for patronage to the small fry of hungry aspirants for office." To - - - "efficient and comprehensive plan" - - - "resting with confidence in the Board of Examiners to be appointed by Government," &c.

But if the question between the Government and the Council of the London University be thus easily settled, or rather disgracefully compromised, it will hardly be so with that other question which lies between the Government and the public. It is no longer to be asked, In what way can the new board be made to produce the *largest amount* of public benefit, but shall its establishment be a public benefit at all, *or shall it be a public evil?* This expression is used advisedly; for although the opening university honours to some portion of a body of men till now excluded from them on account of peculiarities of religious creed—*i. e.* to so many dissenters as may have within their reach the chartered college in Gower Street, or any other college which may in any way contrive to get a charter

hereafter--would have been a public benefit *twelve months ago*, when it would, in fact, have been a step gained towards the attainment of the ultimate object—*that every man possessing the qualifications declared necessary for a degree*, IN WHAT WAY SOEVER HE MAY HAVE ACQUIRED THEM, *shall have within his reach the means of obtaining that degree*;—although it be admitted that this would have been a public benefit *then*, it would *not* be so *now*. That ultimate object has been offered to us—we have had it, as it were, within our grasp; if it now elude that grasp--if it shall have been but a vision already fleeting before our eyes—shall we not know that we have to ascribe the loss to fraud? and shall we now compromise the principle we have contended for, by accepting less than the whole? Should we not thereby defer indefinitely the realization of our hopes?

It has been laid down as a political axiom, that when a law is felt to be injurious, the next best course to obtaining its repeal is to insist on its *strict* execution, and its own weight will break it down. So with the present question of academical degrees: if they are not to be free to all men, let one party in the state continue to have an exclusive privilege in them, and, public attention once awakened to its importance, the evil will quickly work its own cure.

The great curse of this country is bit-by-bit legislation—an everlasting attempt to mutilate every great principle or public interest, in order to adapt it to what are supposed to be the *particular interests* of this or that body, this or that little party of men—an attempt not infrequently made in so clumsy a manner as really to satisfy nobody: the public at large, however, always *paying the expense*. Nor is this confined to those matters of direct political conflict, in which excuses for it are so readily found; on the contrary, on nothing has it operated so strongly as on education, thereby striking at the very root of the energies which require the freest and the fullest culture, in order to fit them to conflict with the evil results of that very influence as discovered in the concerns of every-day life. Is this to last for ever?

It is in the House of Commons this question should be put; and there can be no better occasion of putting it than that afforded by the attempt about to be made, to prostitute the establishment of a university examining board,—which, it had been fondly thought, was to mark a new era in the educational annals of this country,—*to the purposes of party*.

Since the foregoing observations were written, a petition against *the mutilated plan* has been presented to the House of Commons, of which the following is a copy:—

"To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

"The humble petition of the Reverend James Alexander Emerton, M.A. of the University of Oxford, Curate of Hanwell, in the County of Middlesex, Sheweth,

"That your Petitioner is the Head Master of a school at Hanwell, which he commenced with an intention of instructing his pupils in the higher departments of literature and science.

"That your Petitioner was rejoiced to hear that your Honourable House, in the last Session of Parliament, had voted an Address to His Majesty, beseeching him to grant his Royal Charter of Incorporation to a Metropolitan University, with a power of conferring degrees, without interfering with certain of the privileges of the ancient Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

"That your Petitioner has heard with surprise and regret that, it is now intended to limit the privilege of obtaining a degree to the students of two schools only, in the first instance, and thus to curtail, in an incalculable measure, the influence this University would otherwise possess; by which, too, the interests of your Petitioner, and that of the school-masters of the United Kingdom generally, will materially suffer, and numbers of the inferior clergy, whose income, in a great degree, depends upon their pupils, will be reduced to indigence.

"That by this measure another monopoly, of which, in other instances, the promoters of the two schools have so much complained, will be created of a more serious nature, in a moral point of view, than that from which they have wished to emancipate themselves; that parents residing in the country will be compelled to expose their children to the moral contaminations of the metropolis, at an age when the passions are the most violent, or forego the advantages which a degree in the University will confer; and that this privilege will only be conferred on those who can afford the expenses attending a long residence in London, in addition to the fees to be paid to the College to which they may belong.

"That the object which the friends of education have so much at heart will still be unaccomplished. Talent and genius, as such, will still go unrewarded, and the energies of those best qualified for education will be seriously impeded, aware, as they must be, that honours and rewards await not them, or those entrusted to them, whatever may be the value of their moral and intellectual qualifications.

"Your Petitioner, therefore, feeling that the institution of a great University in the metropolis of the kingdom, ought to operate as a stimulus to the honourable competition of all the schools in the empire, in advancing and strengthening the intellectual powers, without deteriorating the religious and moral feelings of the community, humbly prays your honourable House to adopt such measures as may be necessary, in order that the honours of the new University may afford encouragement to talent and industry in whatever situation they may be found; and your petitioner will ever pray, &c.

"James Alexander Emerton.

"*Hanwell, Feb.* 12, 1836."

This is an excellent example, and it ought to be generally followed. *Why should not a public meeting be called in London for the purpose of petitioning Parliament, and that immediately?*

February 29, 1836.

Compton & Ritchie, Printers, Middle Street, Cloth Fair, London.

This book should be returned to the Library on or before the last date stamped below.

A fine of five cents a day is incurred by retaining it beyond the specified time.

Please return promptly.

JAN 11 '62 H

CANCELLED

DUE NOV. 7 4 H

NOV 1974

CANCELLED

FEB 4 '74 H

FEB 2 1974

CFA

This book should be retur
the Library on or before the la
stamped below.
A fine of five cents a day is in
by retaining it beyond the sp
time.
Please return promptly.

JAN 11 '62 H

CANCELLED
NOV 29 '71

DUE NOV 29 74 H

FEB 4 '74 H